



[Handwritten signature]

Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 018793-253

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	
)	
Takeya ABE et al.)	Group Art Unit: 1652
)	
Application No.: 09/936,514)	Examiner: Christian Fronda
)	
Filed: September 14, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 4410
)	
For: PROCESS FOR PURIFYING)	
AMIDE COMPOUND)	

RESPONSE TO UNITY OF INVENTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the unity of invention requirement, applicants hereby elect the subject matter of Group I which currently contains claims 1-4 and 7-24. This election is made with traverse for the following reasons.

The Examiner has stated in the Action that the technical feature shared between the inventions of Group I and Group II is a process for purifying an amide-containing solution by contacting the solution with activated carbon. The Examiner has then alleged that Oriel et al., WO 99/55719, teaches this technical feature and has therefore concluded unity of invention is lacking.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has failed to consider each and every element set forth in claim 1. That is, claim 1 does not merely recite a process wherein an amide-containing solution is contacted with activated carbon. Instead, the claim specifically recites that such contact is "under acidic conditions". This

recitation is important in obtaining good recovery of the amide. Such understanding can be reached by considering the illustrative Examples and the Comparative Example set forth starting on page 18 of the specification. As provided therein, when following the process as defined in claim 1, effective protein removal from the solution can be obtained under acidic conditions (99% or more in Example 1). However, as shown in Comparative Example 1 on page 31, when the pH is adjusted to pH 7, the removing rate was only 25%.

Oriel et al. does not teach this specific condition defined in claim 1 and certainly does not recognize the effect that the claimed acidic conditions have on the process. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over this document and it also follows that the claims of record fully comply with the unity of invention provisions and should all be examined together. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction/unity of invention requirement and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Robert G. Mukai
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: October 26, 2004